arXiv:1703.01658v1 [math.ST] 5 Mar 2017

The wrapping hull and a unified framework for estimating the volume of a body

Nicolai Baldin*
Statslab, Department of Pure
Mathematics and Mathematical Statistics
University of Cambridge
n.baldin@statslab.cam.ac.uk

March 7, 2017

Abstract

This paper develops a unified framework for estimating the volume of a set in $\mathbb{R}^d$ based on observations of points uniformly distributed over the set. The framework applies to all classes of sets satisfying one simple axiom: a class is assumed to be intersection stable. No further hypotheses on the boundary of the set are imposed; in particular, the convex sets and the so-called weakly-convex sets are covered by the framework. The approach rests upon a homogeneous Poisson point process model. We introduce the so-called wrapping hull, a generalization of the convex hull, and prove that it is a sufficient and complete statistic. The proposed estimator of the volume is simply the volume of the wrapping hull scaled with an appropriate factor. It is shown to be consistent for all classes of sets satisfying the axiom and mimics an unbiased estimator with uniformly minimal variance. The construction and proofs hinge upon an interplay between probabilistic and geometric arguments. The tractability of the framework is numerically confirmed in a variety of examples.

Keywords: volume estimation, wrapping hull, trapping systems, Poisson point process, UMVU, stopping set, missing volume

MSC code: 60G55, 62G05, 62M30

1 Introduction

The problem of estimating the support of a density has been receiving a large amount of attention in the statistical literature since the 1980s partly because of vast areas of applications in image analysis, signal processing and econometrics. The first fundamental results in this area were obtained in Devroye and Wise (1980); Korostelev and Tsybakov (1993a,b, 1994); Cuevas and Fraiman (1997). Furthermore, see Tsybakov (1997); Rigollet and Vert (2009); Mason and Polonik (2009) for a more general problem of estimating the level sets of a density. In particular, Korostelev and Tsybakov (1993a) established the minimax optimal rates for estimating the support of a

*Financial support by the European Research Council (ERC) Grant No. 647812 is particularly acknowledged.

density having a Hölder-continuous boundary in the Hausdorff and symmetric difference metrics and constructed an estimator which attains the optimal rates. The case of convex support estimation was first studied in Korostelev and Tsybakov (1994, 1993b), where it was shown that the convex hull $\widehat{C}$ of the sample points, which is the maximum likelihood estimator, is rate-optimal for estimating the support set C in the Hausdorff and symmetric difference metrics.

The volume of a set is one of its most basic characteristics. Surprisingly, as it was shown in Korostelev and Tsybakov (1993a,b), the volume of a rate-optimal estimator of the set is not necessarily a rate-optimal estimator of the volume. The first fully rate-optimal estimators of the volume of a convex support with smooth boundary and a support with Hölder-continuous boundary were constructed by Gayraud (1997) based on three-fold sample splitting. A more efficient and flexible estimator of the volume of a convex set with no assumption on the boundary was recently proposed in Baldin and Reiß (2016). In fact the proposed estimator is simple to compute and non-asymptotically efficient. The problem of calculating the volume of a convex set has also attracted mathematicians working in computer science and computational geometry, see Dyer, Frieze, and Kannan (1991); Kannan, Lovász, and Simonovits (1997); Lovász and Vempala (2006). The setting is slightly different: an experimenter uses a sampling algorithm that generates points over the space that either fall inside or outside a set (this information is obtained via queries to the oracle). We refer to Vempala (2010) for a recent survey of the existing fast randomised algorithms for calculating the volume of a convex set. To the best of our knowledge, no efficient estimators of the volume of a more general than convex class of sets have been rigorously studied.

1.1 Main contribution and the structure

In the present paper, we combine techniques from statistics and stochastic geometry to build a general framework for estimating the volume of a set. We focus on the Poisson point process (PPP) observation model with intensity $\lambda > 0$ on a set A. We thus observe

$$X_1, ..., X_N \overset{i.i.d.}{\sim} U(A), \quad N \sim \text{Poiss}(\lambda|A|),$$

where $(X_n), N$ are independent. The set A is meant to belong to a class $\mathbf{A}$ satisfying one simple axiom: *the class is assumed to be intersection stable*, see Section 2 for a concise definition. The classes of sets covered by the axiom hence include:

- convex sets;
- weakly-convex sets, i.e. sets satisfying the outside rolling-ball condition;
- star-shaped sets with a Hölder-continuous boundary;
- concentric sets;
- compact sets.

In Section 2, we introduce the so-called *wrapping hull* $\widehat{A}$, which can informally be described as the minimal set from the class that contains the data points $X_1, ..., X_N$. It is then used in Section 3 to construct the so-called oracle estimator for the volume of a set belonging to one of the aforementioned classes when the intensity λ of the

process is known. The oracle estimator is shown to be uniformly of minimum variance among unbiased estimators (UMVU). Section 4 is devoted to the estimation of the intensity and derives a fully data-driven estimator of the volume,

$$\widehat{\vartheta} = \frac{N+1}{N_\circ + 1}|\widehat{A}|\,, \tag{1.1}$$

where $N_\circ$ is the number of data points lying in the interior of the wrapping hull. The mean squared risk of the estimator is shown to mimic the mean squared risk of the oracle estimator. Although the main object of analysis is the PPP model, the uniform model is used in the proofs of some of the statements. We then use "Poissonisation" to derive analogous statements for the PPP model. Some of the theoretical results in the present paper are underpinned by the results for the convex case, cf. Section 3, Theorem 4.1 and Theorem 4.4 in Section 4, and the corresponding results in Baldin and Reiß (2016). Not violating the flow of the paper, we shall therefore omit some of the proofs of the statements that are deduced from the proofs of the corresponding statements for the convex case. Broadly speaking, a key observation igniting the development of the present framework is that estimation of the volume of convex sets can in fact solely rely upon the property of convex sets being stable rather than convexity itself. This striking observation appears to have a substantial value for volume estimation in a variety of scenarios far beyond convexity. Volume estimation for some of the classes covered by the framework, in particular, the weakly-convex sets, has been long seen as notoriously difficult with standard geometric arguments, see the references in Section 5. Section 5 further establishes the rates of convergence of the oracle estimator and the estimator $\widehat{\vartheta}$ in (1.1) for the considered classes of sets satisfying the axiom. Theorem 4.5 states a generalized Efron's identity for the wrapping hull, cf. Efron (1965), which reduces the analysis of the mean squared error of the estimator $\widehat{\vartheta}$ to the distributional characteristics of the missing volume $|A\setminus\widehat{A}|$, a uniform lower bound on its expectation and a uniform deviation inequality. Interestingly, a uniform lower bound on the expectation of the missing volume has not even been established for the class of convex sets. We therefore only prove it for a relatively simple class of concentric sets in Section 5.2 and leave a more general question to future research. In volume estimation of weakly-convex sets there is a further peculiar question of adaptation to a smoothing parameter. We suggest an adaptation procedure inspired by Lepski's method, cf. Lepskii (1992), and study it numerically in Section 6. Our numerical results in Section 6, mainly devoted to volume estimation for the weakly-convex sets, in particular, demonstrate that overestimating the smoothing parameter may have a significant cost for volume estimation. Some of the technical lemmata are deferred to the Appendix. Finally, we encounter and state a variety of new open questions in stochastic geometry, which we barely begin to nibble at the edges. Interestingly enough, the framework was mentioned in a seminal paper Kendall (1974) by David Kendall in the Statslab at the University of Cambridge, but has never been fully explored.

1.1.1 A simple one-dimensional example

Let $X_1, ..., X_n$ be a sample of i.i.d. points drawn from the uniform distribution $U(a,b)$, and let $X_{(1)}, ..., X_{(n)}$ denote the order statistics, so that $X_{(1)} < ... < X_{(n)}$. It holds by symmetry that the expected length of the interval $(X_{(1)}, X_{(n)})$ satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}[|X_{(n)} - X_{(1)}|] = \frac{(n-1)}{(n+1)}(b-a)\,. \tag{1.2}$$



Figure 1: The points $X_1, ..., X_n$ drawn uniformly over a set C, the convex hull of the points $\widehat{C} = \mathrm{conv}(X_1, ..., X_n)$ and the dilated hull estimator $\widetilde{C}$.

An objective of statistical inference is to estimate the length of the interval, when the location of the points a and b is assumed to be unknown. A naive estimator for the length,

$$\widehat{l}_{naive} := X_{(n)} - X_{(1)}\,,$$

clearly performs rather poorly. A more attractive idea is to somehow dilate the interval $(X_{(1)}, X_{(n)})$ and take the length of the dilated interval as an estimator for $|b-a|$. There are at least two viable dilations: 1) add and subtract some fixed vectors from the end points $X_{(n)}$ and $X_{(1)}$ (additive dilation) and 2) dilate the interval $(X_{(1)}, X_{(n)})$ from its centre $(X_{(n)} - X_{(1)})/2$ with some scaling factor (multiplicative dilation). In the one-dimensional case, both dilations are equivalent. It follows from (1.2) that a reasonable additive dilation factor is $2(X_{(n)} - X_{(1)})/(n-1)$ which yields an estimator for the volume,

$$\widehat{l}_1 := \frac{(n+1)}{(n-1)}(X_{(n)} - X_{(1)})\,.$$

This estimator is not only *unbiased*, $\mathbb{E}[\widehat{l}_1] = b - a$, but also, as we shall see in Section 3 and Section 4, is minimax optimal and outperforms the estimator $\widehat{l}_{naive}$.

1.1.2 Estimation of the volume of a convex set in high dimensions

The one-dimensional model is useful to grasp the main ideas of volume estimation, yet it is not widely used in real applications. The two-dimensional model already covers several important applications in image analysis and signal processing. Here, we observe the points $X_1, ..., X_n$ drawn uniformly over a set $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ and an objective is to recover the volume V_C of the set and the set itself. Let us assume that C belongs to the class of convex sets. The wrapping hull is then simply the convex hull $\widehat{C}$ of the points $\widehat{C} = \mathrm{conv}(X_1, ..., X_n)$. Analogously to the one-dimensional case, it is natural to consider the volume $|\widehat{C}|$ of the convex hull as a baseline estimator for the volume V_C of the set C. It is quite intuitive that this estimator performs quite poorly because it always underestimates the true volume and it should therefore be dilated as in the one-dimensional case. Section 3 and Section 4 show that an optimal estimator has the following form

$$\widehat{V}_{opt} = \frac{n+1}{n_\circ + 1}|\widehat{C}|\,, \tag{1.3}$$

where $n_\circ$ is the number of purple points in Figure 1 that lie in the interior of the convex hull $\widehat{C}$. Note that $\widehat{V}_{opt}$ is the volume of the "dilated" hull $\widetilde{C}$, the set obtained by dilating the convex hull with the same factor from the centre of gravity $\widehat{x}_0$ of the convex hull:

$$\widetilde{C} = \Big\{ \widehat{x}_0 + \Big(\frac{n+1}{n_\circ + 1} \Big)^{1/d} (x - \widehat{x}_0) \,\Big|\, x \in \widehat{C} \Big\},$$

which can in fact be used to estimate the set C itself. Similarly, the same estimators for the volume and the set itself can be used in higher dimensions.

The uniform model of a fixed number of points drawn uniformly over a convex set C has been extensively studied in stochastic geometry. The focus of study is rather on understanding the distributional characteristics of key functionals like the volume of $\widehat{C}$, the number of vertices of $\widehat{C}$ and the distance between $\widehat{C}$ and C. The main references here are Bárány and Larman (1988); Reitzner (2003, 2005); Vu (2005); Pardon (2011). The Poisson point process (PPP) model studied in the present paper is closely related to the uniform model. Using Poissonisation and de-Poissonisation techniques, this model exhibits asymptotic properties like the uniform model, see e.g. the references above. However the geometric properties of the PPP model are much more fecund for conducting statistical inference, see Reiß and Selk (2017); Baldin and Reiß (2016), where the techniques from the Poisson point processes theory were successfully employed for estimation of linear functionals in a one-sided regression model and estimation of the volume of a convex set.

1.1.3 How fast can we estimate π?

There quite a few ways how one can calculate the number π, see Arndt and Haenel (2001). We here discuss one interesting way based on the Monte Carlo simulations of independent uniformly distributed random variables. It is a toy illustrative application of volume estimation. Let us draw the points $X_1, ..., X_N$ from the uniform distribution over the square $[0,1] \times [0,1]$ and count the number of points n which fall inside the circle centred at the origin of radius 1. Let $\widehat{\pi} := n/N$ denote the ratio of the points inside the circle to the total number of points. It approximately equals $\pi/4$, because it is an unbiased estimator:

$$\mathbb{E}[\widehat{\pi}] = \frac{1}{N}\mathbb{E}[n] = \frac{1}{N}\mathbb{E}\big[\sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbf{1}(X_i \in C)\big] = \frac{\pi}{4},$$

and therefore its mean squared risk is governed by the variance:

$$\mathbb{E}\big[(\widehat{\pi} - \pi)^2\big] = \mathrm{Var}(\widehat{\pi}) = \frac{1}{N^2}\mathrm{Var}\big(\sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbf{1}(X_i \in C)\big) = \frac{1}{N}\frac{\pi}{4}\big(1 - \frac{\pi}{4}\big).$$

It turns out $\widehat{\pi}$ is even a maximum likelihood estimator. Surprisingly, we are able to estimate π with a much faster rate based on the data points in this experiment. Following (1.3), we define our properly scaled estimator as

$$\widehat{\pi}_{opt} = 4\frac{n+1}{n_\circ + 1}|\widehat{C}|,$$

where $n_\circ$ is the number of points lying inside the convex hull $\widehat{C}$ of the points lying inside the circle. Theorem 3.2 and Theorem 4.4 to follow state that the rate of



Figure 2: On the left: a sample of $n = 500$ points drawn uniformly over the square $[0,1] \times [0,1]$. On the right: Monte Carlo root mean squared error (RMSE) estimates for the studied estimators for π based on 200 Monte Carlo simulations in each case.

convergence of the mean squared risk of the estimator $\widehat{\pi}_{opt}$ satisfies $\mathbb{E}\big[(\widehat{\pi}_{opt} - \pi)^2\big] = \mathcal{O}(N^{-5/3})$, see Figure 2 for a numerical comparison of the two estimators. Note that both estimators can well be computed in polynomial time.

2 Poisson point process theory and the wrapping hull

In this section, we slightly digress on Poisson point processes and introduce the main notions. Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space, fix a convex compact set $\mathbf{E}$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$ and equip it with the Borel σ-algebra $\mathcal{E}$ with respect to the Euclidean metric ρ. Without loss of generality one may assume that $\mathbf{E} = [0,1]^d$. By a *point process* $\mathcal{N}$ on $\mathbf{E}$ we mean an integer-valued random measure, or a kernel, from the probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ into $(\mathbf{E}, \mathcal{E})$. Thus, $\mathcal{N}$ is a mapping from $(\Omega, \mathbb{E})$ into $\{0, 1, ...\}$ such that $\mathcal{N}(\omega, \bullet)$ is an integer-valued measure for fixed $\omega \in \Omega$ and $\mathcal{N}(\bullet, B)$ is an integer-valued random variable for fixed $B \in \mathcal{E}$. For convenience, we write $\mathcal{N}(B) = \mathcal{N}(\bullet, B)$. It is equivalent to think of $\mathcal{N}$ as a random element in the space $M(\mathbf{E})$ of all point measures on $\mathbf{E}$, equipped with a σ-algebra $\mathcal{M} = \sigma(m \mapsto m(A), A \in \mathcal{E})$, see e.g. Lemma 1.37 in Kallenberg (2002). A useful topology for $M(\mathbf{E})$ is the *weak topology* which makes $M(\mathbf{E})$ a complete, separable metric space, cf. Section 3.4 in Resnick (2013).

Let $\mathbf{K}$ be the set of all compact subsets of $\mathbf{E}$ equipped with its Borel σ-algebra $\mathfrak{B}_{\mathbf{K}}$ with respect to the Hausdorff-metric ρ_H defined for two non-empty compact sets A and B by

$$\rho_H(A, B) = \max\big(\sup_{x \in B} \rho(x, A), \sup_{x \in A} \rho(x, B)\big).$$

It is known, see Theorem C.5 in Molchanov (2006), that the Borel σ-algebra $\mathfrak{B}_{\mathbf{K}}$ coincides with the σ-algebra $\sigma([B]_{\mathbf{K}}, B \in \mathbf{K})$ with $[B]_{\mathbf{K}} = \{A \in \mathbf{K} : A \subseteq B\}$. Moreover, the space $(\mathbf{K}, \rho_H)$ is Polish.

Let $\mathbf{A} \subseteq \mathbf{K}$ be a family of compact subsets of $\mathbf{E}$ fulfilling the following axiom

AXIOM 2.1. $\mathbf{A}$ is closed under arbitrary intersections and $\varnothing, \mathbf{E} \in \mathbf{A}$.

Then the metric subspace $(\mathbf{A}, \rho_H)$ has the induced Borel σ-algebra $\mathfrak{B}_{\mathbf{A}} = \mathbf{A} \cap \mathfrak{B}_{\mathbf{K}} = \{\mathbf{A} \cap K : K \in \mathfrak{B}_{\mathbf{K}}\}$, which thus coincides with the σ-algebra $\mathcal{A} = \sigma([B], B \in \mathbf{A})$ where $[B] = \{A \in \mathbf{A} : A \subseteq B\}$. It turns out there is a fascinating connection between the families of sets satisfying Axiom 2.1 and the *trapping systems* introduced in the groundbreaking work of Kendall (1974) on the theory of random sets, see also Section 7.2 in Molchanov (2006).

We call a point process $\mathcal{N} : \Omega \to M(\mathbf{E})$ a Poisson point process (PPP) of intensity $\lambda > 0$ on $A \in \mathbf{A}$, if

- for any $B \in \mathcal{E}$, we have $\mathcal{N}(B) \sim \text{Poiss}\big(\lambda|A \cap B|\big)$, where $|A \cap B|$ denotes the Lebesgue measure of $A \cap B$;
- for all mutually disjoint sets $B_1, ..., B_n \in \mathcal{E}$, the random variables $\mathcal{N}(B_1), ..., \mathcal{N}(B_n)$ are independent.

For statistical inference, we assume the Poisson point process to be defined on a set of non zero Lebesgue measure, i.e. $|A| > \delta$ for $\delta > 0$. A more constructive geometric characterisation of the PPP $\mathcal{N}$ is $\mathcal{N} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \delta_{X_i}$ for $N \sim \text{Poiss}(\lambda|A|)$ and i.i.d. random variables (X_i), independent of N and distributed uniformly $\mathbb{P}(X_i \in B) = |A \cap B|/|A|$, so that $\mathcal{N}(B) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbf{1}(X_i \in B)$ for any $B \in \mathcal{E}$.

Interestingly, one can view $(\mathcal{N}(K), K \in \mathbf{K})$ as a set-indexed stochastic process. It has no direct order and its natural filtration is defined by

$$\mathcal{F}_K \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sigma(\{\mathcal{N}(U); U \subseteq K, U \in \mathbf{K}\})$$

for any $K \in \mathbf{K}$. The filtration $(\mathcal{F}_K, K \in \mathbf{K})$ possesses the following properties:

- monotonicity: $\mathcal{F}_{K_1} \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{K_2}$ for any $K_1, K_2 \in \mathbf{K}$ with $K_1 \subseteq K_2$,
- continuity from above: $\mathcal{F}_K = \cap_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{F}_{K_i}$ if $K_i \downarrow K$;

cf. Zuyev (1999). By construction, the restriction $\mathcal{N}_K = \mathcal{N}(\cdot \cap K)$ of the point process $\mathcal{N}$ onto $K \in \mathbf{K}$ is $\mathcal{F}_K$-measurable (in fact, $\mathcal{F}_K = \sigma(\{\mathcal{N}_K(U); U \in \mathbf{K}\})$). Moreover, it can be easily seen that $\mathcal{N}_K$ is a Poisson point process in $\mathbf{M}$, cf. the Restriction Theorem in Kingman (1992).A random compact set $\mathcal{K}$ is a measurable mapping $\mathcal{K} : (\mathbf{M}, \mathcal{M}) \to (\mathbf{K}, \mathfrak{B}_{\mathbf{K}})$. We recall the definition of stopping sets from Baldin and Reiß (2016) in complete analogy with stopping times.

Definition 2.2. *A random compact set $\mathcal{K}$ is called an $\mathcal{F}_K$-stopping set if $\{\mathcal{K} \subseteq K\} \in \mathcal{F}_K$ for all $K \in \mathbf{K}$. The sigma-algebra of $\mathcal{K}$-history is defined as $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{K}} = \{A \in \mathfrak{F} : A \cap \{\mathcal{K} \subseteq K\} \in \mathcal{F}_K \ \forall K \in \mathbf{K}\}$, where $\mathfrak{F} = \sigma(\mathcal{F}_K; K \in \mathbf{K})$.*

We introduce the *wrapping hull* of the PPP points on a set $A \in \mathbf{A}$, which is served as a set-estimator of A.

Definition 2.3. *The* $\mathbf{A}$-wrapping hull *(or simply the wrapping hull) of the PPP points is a mapping $\widehat{A} : M \to \mathbf{A}$ defined as*

$$\widehat{A} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathit{wrap}_{\mathbf{A}}\{X_1, ..., X_N\} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcap\{A \in \mathbf{A} : X_i \in A, \forall i = 1, ..., N\}.$$

For a set $A \subseteq \mathbf{E}$ let A^c denote its complement.

Lemma 2.4. *The set* $\widehat{\mathcal{K}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \overline{\widehat{A}^c}$*, the closure of the complement of the wrapping hull, is an* $(\mathcal{F}_K)$*-stopping set.*

The proof essentially repeats the steps of the proof of an analogous statement for the convex hull of the PPP points given in Lemma 2.2 in Baldin and Reiß (2016).

We shall define the *likelihood function* for the PPP model. Note that we can evaluate the probability

$$\mathbb{P}_A\big(\widehat{A} \in B\big) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda|A|}\lambda^k}{k!} \int_{A^k} \mathbf{1}(\mathrm{wrap}_{\mathbf{A}}\{x_1, ..., x_k\} \in B)\, \mathrm{d}(x_1, ..., x_k)$$

for $B \in \mathfrak{B}_{\mathbf{A}}$. Usually, we only write the subscript A or sometimes (A, λ) when different probability distributions are considered simultaneously. The likelihood function $L(A, \mathcal{N}) = \frac{\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}_{A,\lambda}}{\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{E},\lambda_0}}$ for $A \in \mathbf{A}$ and $\lambda, \lambda_0 > 0$ is then given by

$$\begin{aligned} L(A, \mathcal{N}) = \frac{\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}_{A,\lambda}}{\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{E},\lambda_0}}(\mathcal{N}) &= \mathrm{e}^{\lambda_0|\mathbf{E}|-\lambda|A|}(\lambda/\lambda_0)^N \mathbf{1}(\forall\, i = 1, ..., N : X_i \in A) \\ &= \mathrm{e}^{\lambda_0|\mathbf{E}|-\lambda|A|}(\lambda/\lambda_0)^N \mathbf{1}(\widehat{A} \subseteq A)\,, \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

cf. Thm. 1.3 in Kutoyants (1998). For the last line, we have used that a point set is in A if and only if its wrapping hull $\widehat{A} = \mathrm{wrap}_{\mathbf{A}}\{X_1, ..., X_N\}$ is contained in A.

We shall further use the following short notation: $N = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{E})$ denotes the total number of points, $N_\circ = \mathcal{N}(\widehat{A}^\circ)$ the number of points in the interior of the wrapping hull $\widehat{A}$ and $N_\partial = \mathcal{N}(\partial\widehat{A}) = \mathcal{N}(\partial\widehat{\mathcal{K}})$ the number of points on the boundary of the wrapping hull. For asymptotic bounds we write $f(x) = O(g(x))$ or $f(x) \lesssim g(x)$ if $f(x)$ is bounded by a constant multiple of $g(x)$ and $f(x) \sim g(x)$ if $f(x) \lesssim g(x)$ as well as $g(x) \lesssim f(x)$.

3 Oracle case: known intensity λ

The main modelling assumption throughout the paper is that the total number of sample points N is a Poisson-distributed random variable

$$N \sim \mathrm{Pois}(\lambda|A|)\,,$$

where the intensity $\lambda > 0$ and $A \in \mathbf{A}$ with $|A| > 0$. All the results of this section and Section 4 assume that the underlying class of sets $\mathbf{A}$ satisfies Axiom 2.1. In the case when λ is known one can just estimate the volume $|A|$ by N/λ, which is an unbiased estimator, whose mean squared risk is given by

$$\mathbb{E}[(N/\lambda - |A|)^2] = \mathrm{Var}(N/\lambda) = |A|/\lambda\,, \tag{3.1}$$

thus implying $\mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-1/2})$-rate of convergence. This rate can be improved. As we shall see in Theorem 3.4, the wrapping hull is a complete and sufficient statistic thus allowing to construct the unique best unbiased estimator of the volume in virtue of the Lehmann-Scheffé theorem. The following theorem is an essential ingredient for deriving it. Although the statement of the theorem is quite intuitive and already used in Privault (2012), the proof turns out to be nontrivial and is deferred to the Appendix. Recall that the set $\widehat{\mathcal{K}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \overline{\widehat{A}^c}$ is an $(\mathcal{F}_K)$-stopping set.

Theorem 3.1. *The number N_∂ of points on the boundary of the wrapping hull $\widehat{A}$ is measurable with respect to the sigma-algebra of $\widehat{\mathcal{K}}$-history $\mathcal{F}_{\widehat{\mathcal{K}}}$. The number of points in the interior of the wrapping hull $N_\circ$ is, conditionally on $\mathcal{F}_{\widehat{\mathcal{K}}}$, Poisson-distributed:*

$$N_\circ \,\big|\, \mathcal{F}_{\widehat{\mathcal{K}}} \sim Poiss(\lambda_\circ) \text{ with } \lambda_\circ \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lambda|\widehat{A}|. \tag{3.2}$$

In addition, we have $\mathcal{F}_{\widehat{\mathcal{K}}} = \sigma(\widehat{A})$, where the latter is the sigma-algebra $\sigma(\{\widehat{A} \subseteq B, B \in \mathcal{A}\})$ completed with the null sets in $\mathfrak{F}$.

Thus, we derive our oracle estimator

$$\widehat{\vartheta}_{\text{oracle}} = \mathbb{E}\Big[\frac{N}{\lambda}|\widehat{A}\Big] = \mathbb{E}\Big[\frac{N}{\lambda}|\mathcal{F}_{\widehat{\mathcal{K}}}\Big] = \mathbb{E}\Big[\frac{N_\circ + N_\partial}{\lambda}|\mathcal{F}_{\widehat{\mathcal{K}}}\Big] = \frac{N_\partial}{\lambda} + |\widehat{A}| \tag{3.3}$$

The measurability of the number of points lying on the wrapping hull intuitively follows from the fact that the number of edges on the boundary of the wrapping hull defines the number of points lying on the boundary.

Theorem 3.2. *For known intensity $\lambda > 0$, the oracle estimator $\widehat{\vartheta}_{oracle}$ is unbiased and of minimal variance among all unbiased estimators (UMVU) in the PPP model with parameter class $\mathbf{A}$. It satisfies*

$$\mathbb{E}\big[(\widehat{\vartheta}_{oracle} - |A|)^2\big] = Var(\widehat{\vartheta}_{oracle}) = \frac{\mathbb{E}[|A \setminus \widehat{A}|]}{\lambda}. \tag{3.4}$$

Remark 3.3. *The theorem asserts that the rate of convergence of $\widehat{\vartheta}_{oracle}$ is in fact faster than $\lambda^{-1/2}$ for all classes of sets $\mathbf{A}$ satisfying Axiom (2.1).*

Proof. By the tower property of conditional expectation, the estimator $\widehat{\vartheta}_{\text{oracle}}$ is unbiased, $\mathbb{E}[\widehat{\vartheta}_{\text{oracle}}] = |A|$. Using law of total variance, we derive

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Var}(\widehat{\vartheta}_{\text{oracle}}) = \mathrm{Var}\Big(\mathbb{E}\Big[\frac{N}{\lambda}|\mathcal{F}_{\widehat{\mathcal{K}}}\Big]\Big) &= \mathrm{Var}(\frac{N}{\lambda}) - \mathbb{E}\Big[\mathrm{Var}\Big(\frac{N}{\lambda}|\mathcal{F}_{\widehat{\mathcal{K}}}\Big)\Big] \\ &= \frac{|A|}{\lambda} - \mathbb{E}\Big[\mathrm{Var}\Big(\frac{N_\circ + N_\partial}{\lambda}|\mathcal{F}_{\widehat{\mathcal{K}}}\Big)\Big] = \frac{\mathbb{E}[|A \setminus \widehat{A}|]}{\lambda}.\end{aligned}$$

Theorem 3.4 below affirms that the wrapping hull $\widehat{A}$ is a complete and sufficient statistic such that by the Lehmann-Scheffé theorem, the estimator $\widehat{\vartheta}_{\text{oracle}}$ has the UMVU property. □

Theorem 3.4. *For known intensity $\lambda > 0$, the wrapping hull $\widehat{A} = wrap_{\mathbf{A}}\{X_1, ..., X_N\}$ is a complete and sufficient statistic.*

The proof of Theorem 3.4 is deferred to the Appendix. Therefore, we reduce the analysis of the performance of the estimator $\widehat{\vartheta}_{\text{oracle}}$ of the volume to the analysis of the performance of the wrapping hull estimator of the set itself, which clearly depends on the geometric properties of classes of sets satisfying Axiom 2.1.

4 Estimating the intensity λ. Data-driven estimator

The main ingredient to deriving the estimator of λ is the fact that the closure of the complement of the $\mathbf{A}$-wrapping hull $\widehat{\mathcal{K}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \overline{\widehat{A}^c}$ is in fact an $(\mathcal{F}_K)$-stopping set

according to Lemma 2.4. Moreover in analogy with a time-indexed Poisson process, our problem boils down to the estimation of the intensity of a time-indexed Poisson process starting from an unknown origin. To see this, recall that according to Theorem 3.1, the number of points $N_\circ$ lying inside the wrapping hull $\widehat{A}$ is Poisson-distributed with intensity $\lambda_\circ \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lambda|\widehat{A}|$ provided that $|\widehat{A}| > 0$:

$$N_\circ \,\big|\, \mathcal{F}_{\widehat{\mathcal{K}}} \sim \text{Poiss}(\lambda_\circ).$$

We aim to find an estimator for $\lambda_\circ^{-1}$. On the event $|\widehat{A}| > 0$, we follow the idea developed in Baldin and Reiß (2016). Namely, we use that the first jump time τ of a time-indexed Poisson process $(Y_t, t > 0)$ with intensity $\nu > 0$ is $\text{Exp}(\nu)$-distributed and hence $\mathbb{E}[\tau] = \nu^{-1}$. Using the memoryless property of the exponential distribution, we then have

$$\mathbb{E}[\tau | Y_1 = m] = \frac{1}{m+1}\mathbf{1}(m \geqslant 1) + (1+\nu^{-1})\mathbf{1}(m = 0)\,.$$

Therefore, we conclude that

$$\widehat{\mu}(N_\circ, \lambda_\circ) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} (N_\circ + 1)^{-1}, & \text{for } N_\circ \geqslant 1, \\ 1 + \lambda_\circ^{-1}, & \text{for } N_\circ = 0 \end{cases}$$

satisfies $\mathbb{E}[\widehat{\mu}(N_\circ, \lambda_\circ)|\mathcal{F}_{\widehat{\mathcal{K}}}] = \lambda_\circ^{-1}$ provided that $|\widehat{A}| > 0$. Omitting the term depending on $\lambda_\circ$ in the unlikely event $N_\circ = 0$, we derive our final estimator:

$$\widehat{\vartheta} = |\widehat{A}| + \frac{N_\partial}{N_\circ + 1}|\widehat{A}| = \frac{N+1}{N_\circ + 1}|\widehat{A}|\,.$$

The proof of the next theorem is straightforward.

Theorem 4.1. *For the bias of the estimator $\widehat{\vartheta}$, it follows*

$$|A| - \mathbb{E}[\widehat{\vartheta}] = \lambda^{-1}\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda|A|}\mathbb{E}\big[N_\partial \mathrm{e}^{\lambda|A\setminus\widehat{A}|}\big]\,, \quad \forall A \in \mathbf{A}\,.$$

Remark 4.2. *As it follows from Definition 2.3, a wrapping hull $\widehat{A}$ may consist of disjoint sets, in which case the number of points $N_{\circ,k}$ lying inside a piece $\widehat{A}_k$ satisfies $N_{\circ,k} \,\big|\, \mathcal{F}_{\widehat{\mathcal{K}}} \sim \text{Poiss}(\lambda|\widehat{A}_k|)$ due to the homogeneity of the Poisson point process. This fact can further be used to estimate λ^{-1} locally. However, in the homogeneous case, we prefer to use the total number of points to estimate the intensity.*

Remark 4.3. *It turns out that unbiased estimation of $\lambda_\circ^{-1}$ is impossible, cf. Remark 4.2 in Baldin and Reiß (2016).*

Note that a more explicit bound can be derived using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality given a bound on the expected number of points N_∂ lying on the wrapping hull $\widehat{A}$ and a bound on the moments of the missing volume $|A \setminus \widehat{A}|$. This clearly depends on a considered class of sets satisfying Axiom 2.1. The following very general oracle inequality holds for the mean squared error of the estimator $\widehat{\vartheta}$. Its proof is deferred to the Appendix.

Theorem 4.4. *The following oracle inequality for the risk of the estimator $\widehat{\vartheta}$ holds for all $A \in \mathbf{A}$ whenever $\lambda|A| \geqslant 1$:*

$$\mathbb{E}[(\widehat{\vartheta} - |A|)^2]^{1/2} \leqslant (1 + c\alpha(\lambda, A))\, Var(\widehat{\vartheta}_{oracle})^{1/2} + r(\lambda, A)\,,$$

where

$$\alpha(\lambda, A) := \frac{1}{|A|}\Big(\frac{Var(|A \setminus \widehat{A}|)}{\mathbb{E}[|A \setminus \widehat{A}|]} + \mathbb{E}[|A \setminus \widehat{A}|]\Big)\,,$$
$$r(\lambda, A) := c_1 \lambda^{-1} \mathbb{E}[N_\partial^4]^{1/4} \mathbb{P}(|A \setminus \widehat{A}| \geqslant |A|/2)^{1/4}\,,$$

with some numeric constants $c, c_1 > 0$. *In particular,* $\alpha(\lambda, A)$ *is bounded by some universal constant.*

4.1 Efron's identity for the wrapping hull

In this section, we show that the rate of convergence of the risk for the estimator $\widehat{\vartheta}$ in Theorem 4.4 hinges in fact upon only a deviation of the missing volume $|A \setminus \widehat{A}|$. More than 50 years ago Efron showed in Efron (1965) that the moments of the number of the points $N_{\partial,k}$ lying on the boundary of a convex hull $\widehat{C}_k$ in the uniform model $X_1, ..., X_k \overset{i.i.d.}{\sim} U(C)$, with $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ being a convex set, satisfies the identity

$$\mathbb{E}[N_{\partial,k}^q] = \sum_{r=1}^{q} n(k, q, r) \mathbb{E}[|\widehat{C}_{k-r}|^r]\,,$$

where $n(k, q, r)$ is the number of q-tuples from $1, ..., k$ having exactly r different values, $n(k, q, r) = \binom{k}{r} \sum_{m=1}^{r} (-1)^{r-m} \binom{r}{m} m^q$. This yields a striking dimension-free asymptotic equivalence result,

$$\mathbb{E}[N_{\partial,k}^q] \sim k^q \mathbb{E}[|C \setminus \widehat{C}_k|^q]\,. \tag{4.1}$$

We here extend this results to the wrapping hull.

Proposition 4.5 (Efron's identity for the wrapping hull)**.** *Let* $\mathbf{A}$ *be any class satisfying Axiom 2.1 and* $\widehat{A}$ *be the corresponding wrapping hull of the PPP points of intensity* $\lambda > 0$ *over a set* $A \in \mathbf{A}$. *Then the following asymptotic inequality holds*

$$\mathbb{E}[N_\partial^q] \lesssim \lambda^q \mathbb{E}[|A \setminus \widehat{A}|^q]\,,$$

provided that the probability of observing q *points lying on the boundary of the wrapping hull* $\widehat{A}$ *is non-zero.*

Remark 4.6. *It follows by Jensen's inequality and (6.4), that* $\mathbb{E}[N_\partial^q] \geqslant \mathbb{E}[N_\partial]^q = \lambda^q \mathbb{E}[|A \setminus \widehat{A}|]^q$. *For some examples, like the class of convex sets, this in fact implies* $\mathbb{E}[N_\partial^q] \sim \lambda^q \mathbb{E}[|A \setminus \widehat{A}|^q]$.

Proof. Let us first consider the uniform model and then transfer the result to the PPP model using Poissonisation. We follow Efron's idea, see also Beermann and Reitzner (2015); Brunel (2014), that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[|A \setminus \widehat{A}_k|^q] &= |A|^q\, \mathbb{P}(X_{k+1} \notin \widehat{A}_k, ..., X_{k+q} \notin \widehat{A}_k) \\
&\geqslant |A|^q\, \mathbb{P}(X_{k+1} \in \partial\widehat{A}_{k+q}, ..., X_{k+q} \in \partial\widehat{A}_{k+q}) \\
&= \frac{|A|^q}{\binom{k+q}{q}}\, \mathbb{E} \sum \mathbf{1}(X_{i_1} \in \partial\widehat{A}_{k+q}, ..., X_{i_q} \in \partial\widehat{A}_{k+q}) = \frac{|A|^q}{\binom{k+q}{q}}\, \mathbb{E}\binom{N_{\partial,k+q}}{q}\,,
\end{aligned}$$

the sum being taken over all tuples $(i_1, ..., i_q)$ from the integers $1, ..., k+q$. Rearranging the terms, this entails $\mathbb{E}[N_{\partial,k}^q] \lesssim k^q \mathbb{E}[|A \setminus \widehat{A}_k|^q]$.

Using Poissonisation, we further derive for the PPP model,

$$\mathbb{E}[|A \setminus \widehat{A}|^q] = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}(|A \setminus \widehat{A}_N|^q \,\big|\, N = k)\, \mathbb{P}(N = k)$$

$$\gtrsim \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (2\lambda)^{-q} \mathbb{E}\big[N_{\partial,k}^q\big]\, \mathbb{P}(N = k) + \sum_{k=\lfloor 2\lambda \rfloor}^{\infty} (k^{-q} - (2\lambda)^{-q}) \mathbb{E}\big[N_{\partial,k}^q\big]\, \mathbb{P}(N = k)$$

$$= (2\lambda)^{-q} \mathbb{E}[N_{\partial}^q] + \sum_{k=\lfloor 2\lambda \rfloor}^{\infty} (k^{-q} - (2\lambda)^{-q}) \mathbb{E}\big[N_{\partial,k}^q\big]\, \mathbb{P}(N = k)$$

with the absolute value of second sum being bounded using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and large deviations by

$$c_1\, \mathbb{E}[N_{\partial}^{2q}]^{1/2} \mathbb{P}(N \geqslant [2\lambda])^{1/2} \leqslant c_1\, \mathbb{E}[N_{\partial}^{2q}]^{1/2} \exp(-c_2 n |C|)\,,$$

for some constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$. Thus, (4.1) follows. □

Proposition 4.5 and Theorem 4.4 immediately suggest the following bound for the remainder term in the oracle inequality,

$$r(\lambda, A) \leqslant c \mathbb{E}[|A \setminus \widehat{A}|^4]^{1/4}\, \mathbb{P}(|A \setminus \widehat{A}| \geqslant |A|/2)^{1/4}\,,$$

for some numeric constant $c > 0$. Therefore, the oracle inequality in Theorem 4.4 hinges upon only two probabilistic results:

- the ratio $\mathrm{Var}(|A \setminus \widehat{A}|)/\mathbb{E}[|A \setminus \widehat{A}|]$ of the moments of the missing volume,
- a uniform deviation inequality for the missing volume.

Both results are fairly involved and we shall only discuss here how to derive them for some simple classes of sets satisfying Axiom 2.1.

5 Classes of sets satisfying Axiom 2.1

This section collects some examples of classes of sets that satisfy Axiom 2.1. Note that the class of all convex sets $\mathbf{C}_{\mathrm{conv}}$ satisfies the axiom and was extensively studied in Baldin and Reiß (2016). The most involved statements in the inference on convex sets were underpinned by the abundance of results from stochastic geometry on moment bounds and deviation inequalities for the missing volume, see Lemma 4.6 in Baldin and Reiß (2016). In particular, the ratio $\mathrm{Var}(|C \setminus \widehat{C}|)/\mathbb{E}[|C \setminus \widehat{C}|] \sim 1/\lambda$ is established in Pardon (2011) for all convex sets C in dimensions $d = 1, 2$. In dimensions $d > 2$, one can bound the ratio only for some subsets of the class of convex sets. Thus, for a convex set C with C^2-boundary of positive curvature, it is known thanks to Reitzner (2005) that $\mathrm{Var}(|C \setminus \widehat{C}|) \lesssim \lambda^{-(d+3)/(d+1)}$. The lower bound for the first moment, $\mathbb{E}[|C \setminus \widehat{C}|] \gtrsim \lambda^{-2/(d+1)}$, was shown in Schütt (1994). For a polytope C, the upper bound $\mathrm{Var}(|C \setminus \widehat{C}|) \lesssim \lambda^{-2}(\log \lambda)^{d-1}$ was obtained in Bárány and Reitzner (2010), while the lower bound for the first moment, $\mathbb{E}[|C \setminus \widehat{C}|] \gtrsim \lambda^{-1}(\log \lambda)^{d-1}$, was proved in Bárány and Larman (1988). A uniform deviation

inequality for convex sets obtained in Thm. 1 in Brunel (2013) allows to derive sharp upper bounds on the moments of the missing volume. The proof of the deviation inequality exploited a bound on the entropy of convex sets. It remains an intriguing open question in stochastic geometry whether $\lambda \mathrm{Var}(|C \setminus \widehat{C}|) \sim \mathbb{E}[|C \setminus \widehat{C}|]$ holds universally for all convex sets in arbitrary dimensions. Some of the classes of sets we consider here are much larger, yet very little has been known about them in the mathematical literature.

5.1 r-convex sets or sets fullfiling the outside rolling ball condition

We denote by $B(x,r) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ (resp. $B_\circ(x,r)$) the closed (resp. open) ball with centre x and radius r.

Definition 5.1. *A compact set C_r in $\mathbf{E} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is called* r-convex *for $r > 0$, if its complement is the union of all open Euclidean balls of diameter r that are disjoint to C_r, i.e. if*

$$C_r = \bigcap_{B^c_\circ(x,r) \cap C_r = \varnothing} B^c_\circ(x,r)\,.$$

We denote the class of r-convex sets by $\mathbf{C}_r$.

Note that an r-convex set fulfills the *outside rolling ball condition*, i.e. for all $y \in \partial C_r$ there is a closed ball $B(x,r)$ such that $y \in \partial B(x,r)$ and $B_\circ(x,r) \cap C_r = \varnothing$. Heuristically this means that one can "roll" a ball of radius r freely over the boundary of a set. Note that according to the definition, r-convex sets can have "holes" and do not need to be connected, see Figure 5 for some examples. In the terminology of Kendall (1974), $C_r \in \mathbf{C}_r$ means that the set C_r is *trapped* by the balls of radius r. The r-convex sets were introduced in Perkal (1956); see Walther (1997); Cuevas, Fraiman, and Pateiro-López (2012) and references therein for a recent work on estimation of r-convex sets. In the literature, much more attention has been devoted to the sets satisfying the so-called *inside and outside rolling ball condition*, when both C_r and $\overline{C_r^c}$ are r-convex, see Mammen and Tsybakov (1995); Walther (1995). The reason probably is that sets with smooth boundaries (with no angles) are sometimes easier to handle with geometric arguments, see Pateiro-López (2008).

The $\mathbf{C}_r$-wrapping hull is defined by

$$\widehat{C}_r := \bigcap_{B^c_\circ(x,r) \cap \{X_1,\ldots,X_N\} = \varnothing} B^c_\circ(x,r)$$

and often called the *r-convex hull* in the literature. Thus the oracle estimator in (3.3) has the following form

$$\widehat{\vartheta}_{r,oracle} := \frac{N_\partial}{\lambda} + |\widehat{C}_r|\,, \tag{5.1}$$

where N_∂ is the number of sample points lying on the the r-convex hull $\widehat{C}_r$. In order to investigate the performance of this estimator according to Theorem 3.2 it suffices to study $\sup_{C_r \in \mathbf{C}_r} \mathbb{E}_{C_r}[|C_r \setminus \widehat{C}_r|]$. In fact the following result holds and it is a consequence of Theorem 3.2.

Theorem 5.2. *For known intensity $\lambda > 0$, the worst case mean squared error of the oracle estimator $\widehat{\vartheta}_{r,oracle}$ over the parameter class $\mathbf{C}_r$ decays as $\lambda \uparrow \infty$ like $\sup_{C_r \in \mathbf{C}_r} \mathbb{E}_{C_r}[|C_r \setminus \widehat{C}_r|]/\lambda$ in dimension d:*

$$\limsup_{\lambda \to \infty} \lambda \sup_{C_r \in \mathbf{C}_r, |C_r| > 0} \left\{ \mathbb{E}\big[(\widehat{\vartheta}_{r,oracle} - |C_r|)^2\big] / \mathbb{E}\big[|C_r \setminus \widehat{C}_r|\big] \right\} < \infty \,.$$

Remark 5.3. *Note that the class of convex sets $\mathbf{C}_{conv}$ belongs to $\mathbf{C}_r$ for all $r > 0$ and thus using Theorem 3.4 in Baldin and Reiß (2016) we have a lower bound on the rate of convergence,*

$$\begin{aligned} &\inf_{\widehat{\vartheta}_\lambda} \lambda^{(d+3)/(d+1)} \sup_{C_r \in \mathbf{C}_r} \mathbb{E}_{C_r}[(|C_r| - \widehat{\vartheta}_\lambda)^2] \\ &\quad \geqslant \inf_{\widehat{\vartheta}_\lambda} \lambda^{(d+3)/(d+1)} \sup_{C \in \mathbf{C}_{conv}} \mathbb{E}_C[(|C| - \widehat{\vartheta}_\lambda)^2] > 0 \,, \end{aligned}$$

where the infimum extends over all estimators $\widehat{\vartheta}_\lambda$ in the PPP model with intensity λ. Furthermore, the rate $\lambda^{-(d+3)/(d+1)}$ is achieved up to a logarithmic factor for sets $C_r \in \mathbf{C}_r$ with a smooth boundary following Pateiro-López (2008).

Following Section 4, the mean squared error of the estimator

$$\widehat{\vartheta}_r := \frac{N+1}{N_\circ + 1} |\widehat{C}_r| \,,$$

satisfies the oracle inequality in Theorem 4.4. Upper bounding the functions $\alpha(\lambda, C_r)$ and $r(\lambda, C_r)$ and establishing an exact rate of convergence of the risk of the estimator $\widehat{\vartheta}_r$ requires sharp probabilistic bounds similarly to the convex case and is beyond the scope of the present paper. In order to compute $\widehat{\vartheta}_r$ in practice, it is crucial to know the radius r. It is clear that $\mathbf{C}_{r_2} \subseteq \mathbf{C}_{r_1}$ for all $r_2 > r_1 > 0$. Define the true radius $r^\star$ corresponding to a set C as

$$r^\star = \sup\{r > 0 : C \in \mathbf{C}_r\} \,.$$

It is intuitively evident that it is better to underestimate the radius $r^\star$, because $\mathbf{C}_{r^\star} \subseteq \mathbf{C}_r$ for all $r^\star > r > 0$. On the other hand, there is a typical bias-variance tradeoff in choosing the optimal parameter r. We prefer to use large values of r when the number of sample points is scarce, and can afford to use small values $r < r^\star$ when there is an abundance of the sample points. We here propose a procedure for estimating $r^\star$ based on Lepski's method Lepskii (1992), see also a more accessible reference, Section 8.2.1 in Giné and Nickl (2016). Fix some $R \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $K \in \mathbb{N}$ and break the interval $(0, R)$ down into $K+1$ pieces $0 < r_1 < ... < r_K < R$ of equal length. Define an estimator for $\widehat{r}$ as

$$\widehat{r} := \inf\left\{ r_{k-1} | \, \exists k' \leqslant k \, : \, |\widehat{\vartheta}_{r_k} - \widehat{\vartheta}_{r_{k'}}| > \varkappa_n \right\} \wedge r_K \,, \tag{5.2}$$

with $\varkappa_n = n^{-1}$. This fairly rough calibration is suggested by Theorem 5.2 in view of $\mathbb{E}_{C_r}[|C_r \setminus \widehat{C}_r|] \leqslant 1$. A more concise calibration requires an exact deviation inequality on the missing volume $|C_r \setminus \widehat{C}_r|$, as it is typically suggested to use the exact rate of convergence for choosing $\varkappa_n$. This question however is beyond the scope of the present paper. We provide a numerical study of this adaptation procedure in Section 6.

5.2 Concentric sets

A class of sets generated by one specific set dilated from its centre fits into the framework as well. We denote this class by $\mathbf{D} \subseteq \mathbf{K}$ and its generator by D. We assume the centre point of a set in the class is known and denote by D_r a member of the class with the distance r from the centre. The class $\mathbf{D}$ turns out to be quite interesting from the mathematical point of view. The $\mathbf{D}$-wrapping hull is given by

$$\widehat{D} := \bigcap_{D_r : \{X_1,\dots,X_N\} \in D_r} D_r \,,$$

and thus determined by only one point of the sample. The event to have more than one point of the sample on the boundary $\partial\widehat{D}$ has measure zero yielding $N_\partial = 1$. This entails for the oracle estimator:

$$\widehat{\vartheta}_{\mathbf{D},oracle} := \frac{1}{\lambda} + |\widehat{D}| \,. \tag{5.3}$$

The risk of $\widehat{\vartheta}_{\mathbf{D},oracle}$ according to Theorem 3.2 depends on $\sup_{D_r \in \mathbf{D}} \mathbb{E}_{D_r}[|D_r \setminus \widehat{D}|]$. As we shall see in Proposition 6.2, the following relation between the missing volume $|D_r \setminus \widehat{D}|$ and the number of points N_∂ lying on the boundary of the wrapping hull $\widehat{D}$ holds:

$$\forall D_r \in \mathbf{D} : \quad \lambda\, \mathbb{E}[|D_r \setminus \widehat{D}|] = 1 \,.$$

Thus, we immediately derive the rate of convergence of $\widehat{\vartheta}_{\mathbf{D},oracle}$.

Lemma 5.4. *For known intensity $\lambda > 0$, the worst case mean squared error of the oracle estimator $\widehat{\vartheta}_{\mathbf{D},oracle}$ over the parameter class $\mathbf{D}$ decays as $\lambda \uparrow \infty$ like λ^{-2}:*

$$\sup_{D_r \in \mathbf{D}} \mathbb{E}\big[(\widehat{\vartheta}_{\mathbf{D},oracle} - |D_r|)^2\big] = \frac{1}{\lambda} \sup_{D_r \in \mathbf{D}} \mathbb{E}_{D_r}[|D_r \setminus \widehat{D}|] = \frac{1}{\lambda^2} \,.$$

Furthermore, the identity (5.3) entails

$$\frac{\mathrm{Var}(|D_r \setminus \widehat{D}|)}{\mathbb{E}[|D_r \setminus \widehat{D}|]} = \lambda \mathbb{E}[|D_r \setminus \widehat{D}|^2] - \frac{1}{\lambda} \,. \tag{5.4}$$

The rate of convergence of the estimator $\widehat{\vartheta}_{\mathbf{D},oracle}$ in Lemma 5.4 is minimax optimal as it follows from the following lemma, which is straightforward to prove using standard techniques for the lower bounds.

Lemma 5.5. *The minimax rate of estimating $|D_r|$ in the PPP model with parameter class $\mathbf{D}$ decays as $\lambda \uparrow \infty$ like λ^{-2}:*

$$\inf_{\widehat{\vartheta}_\lambda} \sup_{D_r \in \mathbf{D}} \mathbb{E}_{D_r}\big[(|D_r| - \widehat{\vartheta}_\lambda)^2\big] \gtrsim \frac{1}{\lambda^2} \,,$$

where the infimum extends over all estimators $\widehat{\vartheta}_\lambda$ in the PPP model with intensity $\lambda > 0$.

Further following the general scheme of estimating λ in Section 4, we have the final estimator for the volume

$$\widehat{\vartheta}_{\mathbf{D}} := \frac{N+1}{N} |\widehat{D}| \,.$$

To establish the asymptotic properties of this estimator, according to Theorem 4.4 and in view of (5.4), it suffices to derive a uniform deviation inequality. The following deviation inequality for the uniform model is easily transferred to the PPP model using poissonisation, cf. Section 4.1.

Lemma 5.6. *In the uniform model with* $X_1, ..., X_n \overset{i.i.d.}{\sim} U(D_r)$, *the following uniform deviation result holds*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \sup_{D_r\in\mathbf{D}} \mathbb{P}_{D_r}\left(n\frac{|D_r \setminus \widehat{D}_n|}{|D_r|} \geqslant x\right) = \mathrm{e}^{-x}\,, \quad \forall x > 0\,. \tag{5.5}$$

Furthermore, $\lim_{n\to\infty} \sup_{D_r\in\mathbf{D}} \mathbb{E}\big[n^q |D_r \setminus \widehat{D}_n|^q / |D_r|^q\big] = q\Gamma(q)$ *for any* $q \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. For any $y \in (0,1)$ and any $D_r \in \mathbf{D}$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}_{D_r}\big(|D_r \setminus \widehat{D}_n| \geqslant y|D_r|\big) = (1-y)^n\,.$$

Taking $y = x/n$ for any $x > 0$ and letting $n \to \infty$ yields (5.5). The result on the moments of the missing volume follows by Fubini's theorem. □

Corollary 5.7. *It follows for the risk of the estimator* $\widehat{\vartheta}_{\mathbf{D}}$ *for all* $D_r \in \mathbf{D}$ *whenever* $\lambda|D_r| \geqslant 1$*:*

$$\mathbb{E}[(\widehat{\vartheta}_{\mathbf{D}} - |D_r|)^2]^{1/2} \leqslant \big(1 + c_1/(\lambda|D_r|)\big)\mathbb{E}[(\widehat{\theta}_{\mathbf{D},oracle} - |D_r|)^2]^{1/2} + c_2\mathrm{e}^{-c_3\lambda}\,,$$

with some numeric constants $c_1, c_2, c_3 > 0$

5.3 Compact sets

Interestingly the class of all compact sets $\mathbf{K}$ of non-zero Lebesgue measure satisfies Axiom 2.1 as well. The richness of this class makes it foremost for conducting statistical inference, yet very little has been proposed and studied so far. Estimation of this class of sets was studied in Devroye and Wise (1980), where it was shown that the union of small Euclidean balls centred at the points of the sample is a consistent estimator of a compact set. The $\mathbf{K}$-wrapping hull is just the union of sample points and so $N_\partial = N$ and $|\widehat{K}| = 0$ a.s. Hence for the oracle estimator in (3.3) we have

$$\widehat{\vartheta}_{\mathbf{K},oracle} := \frac{N}{\lambda}\,.$$

This estimator is unbiased and from (3.1) the following result immediately follows.

Lemma 5.8. *For known intensity* $\lambda > 0$*, the worst case mean squared error of the oracle estimator* $\widehat{\vartheta}_{\mathbf{K},oracle}$ *over the parameter class* $\mathbf{K}$ *decays as* $\lambda \uparrow \infty$ *like* λ^{-1}*:*

$$\sup_{K\in\mathbf{K}} \frac{1}{|K|}\mathbb{E}\big[(\widehat{\vartheta}_{\mathbf{K},oracle} - |K|)^2\big] = \frac{1}{\lambda}\,.$$

It seems impossible without imposing further structure on the class $\mathbf{K}$ to estimate λ in this scenario.



Figure 3: The two concentric sets (blue), observations (points) and their $\mathbf{D}$-wrapping hulls (dashed lines).

5.4 Polytopes

It was noted in Baldin and Reiß (2016), that the estimator of the volume based on the $\mathbf{C}_{\mathrm{conv}}$-wrapping hull estimator (the convex hull $\widehat{C}$) is adaptive to the class of polytopes $\mathbf{P}$ (see Remark 3.3). In fact, the estimator

$$\widehat{\vartheta}_{\mathbf{P},oracle} := \frac{N_\partial}{\lambda} + |\widehat{C}|$$

satisfies

Lemma 5.9. *For known intensity $\lambda > 0$, the worst case mean squared error of the oracle estimator $\widehat{\vartheta}_{\mathbf{P},oracle}$ over the parameter class $\mathbf{P}$ decays as $\lambda \uparrow \infty$ like $\lambda^{-2}(\log(\lambda))^{d-1}$:*

$$\limsup_{\lambda\to\infty} \lambda^2(\log(\lambda))^{1-d} \sup_{P\in\mathbf{P},|P|>0} \Big\{\mathbb{E}\big[(\widehat{\vartheta}_{\mathbf{P},oracle} - |P|)^2\big]\Big\} < \infty\,.$$

We stress here, however, that the class polytopes $\mathbf{P}$ does not satisfy Axiom 2.1. The framework applies to the class of convex sets $\mathbf{C}$ and Lemma 5.9 only allows to improve the rate for the subclass of $\mathbf{C}$. The class $\mathbf{P}$ is stable only under finite intersections; taking arbitrary (possibly uncountable) intersections, one can obtain an element not lying in the class.

6 Illustrative simulations

Let us first consider the two classes of concentric sets generated by a ball with a centre at $x = (0.5, 0.5)$ and a square with a centre at the same point, see Figure 3. The mean squared error estimate is based on $M = 1000$ Monte Carlo iterations in each case. We demonstrate the result of Lemma 5.4 that in fact

$$\mathbb{E}\big[(\widehat{\vartheta}_D - |D_r|)^2\big] = \frac{1}{\lambda^2}\,,$$

by plotting the mean squared error estimate multiplied by the intensity squared λ^2 with respect to λ in Figure 4. One can see that the lines in the plots are fairly closed to 1 supporting the claim. The simulations were implemented using the R package "spatstat" by Baddeley and Turner (2005).



Figure 4: The mean squared error $\mathbb{E}\big[(\widehat{\vartheta}_{\mathbf{D}} - |D_r|)^2\big]$ multiplied by the intensity squared λ^2 with respect to λ for the ball and the square from Figure 3.

Furthermore we consider the class of r-convex sets. Our primal example of an r-convex set for simulations is the annulus $C_{r^\star} = B(0.5, 0.5) \setminus B(0.5, 0.25)$. Thus clearly $C_{r^\star} \in \mathbf{C}_r$ for all $0 < r \leqslant 0.25$. Figure 5 depicts the r-convex hull estimator (5.1) for $r = 0.01, 0.04, 0.2, 1$ based on the observations of the PPP with $\lambda = 300$. An important observation is that once the value of r is larger than the true radius $r^\star$ of an r-convex set, the r-convex hull essentially misses the "holes" of radius $r^\star$. One should bear this in mind when using large values of r for constructing the oracle estimator when the number of observation points is small. This subtle issue is depicted in Figure 6, where the root mean squared error of the oracle estimator $\widehat{\vartheta}_{r,oracle}$ for the volume (black line), based on the r-convex hull with $r = 0.04$, converges to the area of the "hole" of size $\pi(0.25)^2 \approx 0.196$. Another striking point is that when the number of observations is small, the r-convex hull with a small value of r essentially coincides with the points themselves and thus the RMSE of the oracle estimator $\widehat{\vartheta}_{r,oracle}$ coincides with the RMSE of $\widehat{\vartheta}_{\mathbf{K},oracle}$ and equals $|C_{r^\star}|/\lambda$ (red line in Figure 6)! Finally we depict RMSE estimates for the oracle estimator $\widehat{\vartheta}_{r,oracle}$ for different r in Figure 7. One can clearly see the regions of decreasing value of the RMSE, the fairly flat value of RMSE and the jump when r becomes larger than the true parameter $r^\star$. Table 1 further collects the Monte Carlo estimates of the number of points $N_\circ$ lying inside the wrapping hull, the number of points N_∂ on the boundary of the wrapping hull and the number of isolated points N_{iso} of the boundary of the wrapping hull. For analyzing the performance of the adaptive estimator proposed in Section 5.1, we break the interval $[0.06, 0.5]$ into pieces of length 0.02, compute the estimates of the radius $\widehat{r}$ from (5.2) and the estimates of the RMSE of $\widehat{\vartheta}_{\widehat{r}}$ based on 200 Monte Carlo iterations in Table 2.

6.1 Appendix

6.1.1 Proof of Theorem 3.4

Sufficiency follows from the Neyman factorisation criterion applied to the likelihood function (2.1), while completeness follows by definition provided that we show

$$\forall A \in \mathbf{A} : \mathbb{E}_A\big[T(\widehat{A})\big] = 0 \implies T(\widehat{A}) = 0 \quad \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{E}} - a.s.$$



Figure 5: The four weakly-convex set with $r^\star = 0.25$ (blue), observations of the PPP with $\lambda = 300$ (points) and their r-convex hulls for different values of r (black).



Figure 6: Monte Carlo RMSE estimates for the oracle estimator for the volume of the annulus $B(0.5, 0.5) \setminus B(0.5, 0.25)$ with respect to the sample size.

$r = 0.04$

$n = \lambda/\lvert A\rvert$	$N_\circ$	N_∂	N_{iso}	$RMSE(\widehat{\vartheta}_{r,oracle})$	$RMSE(\widehat{\vartheta}_r)$	$\frac{RMSE(\widehat{\vartheta}_r)}{RMSE(\widehat{\vartheta}_{r,oracle})}$
50	0.13	49.8	44	0.087	0.55	6.31
100	1.5	98.37	66	0.059	0.33	4.65
200	23.6	175.8	58	0.042	0.15	3.7
300	90.4	211	33	0.039	0.109	2.82
400	191.6	210	17	0.043	0.085	1.97

$r = 0.1$

$n = \lambda/\lvert A\rvert$	$N_\circ$	N_∂	N_{iso}	$RMSE(\widehat{\vartheta}_{r,oracle})$	$RMSE(\widehat{\vartheta}_r)$	$\frac{RMSE(\widehat{\vartheta}_r)}{RMSE(\widehat{\vartheta}_{r,oracle})}$
50	8.5	42.16	8.52	0.071	0.138	1.94
100	45.9	53.34	1.37	0.043	0.064	1.48
200	138.2	60.95	0.03	0.021	0.027	1.26
300	233.4	68.08	0	0.015	0.018	1.20
400	326.1	74.40	0	0.013	0.015	1.15

$r = 0.25$

$n = \lambda/\lvert A\rvert$	$N_\circ$	N_∂	N_{iso}	$RMSE(\widehat{\vartheta}_{r,oracle})$	$RMSE(\widehat{\vartheta}_r)$	$\frac{RMSE(\widehat{\vartheta}_r)}{RMSE(\widehat{\vartheta}_{r,oracle})}$
50	24.75	24.21	0.06	0.061	0.085	1.39
100	68.58	29.60	0	0.033	0.0405	1.20
200	163.75	36.03	0	0.018	0.019	1.04
300	261.44	40.68	0	0.0108	0.0124	1.13
400	357.41	44.17	0	0.0096	0.0104	1.076

$r = 0.3$

$n = \lambda/\lvert A\rvert$	$N_\circ$	N_∂	N_{iso}	$RMSE(\widehat{\vartheta}_{r,oracle})$	$RMSE(\widehat{\vartheta}_r)$	$\frac{RMSE(\widehat{\vartheta}_r)}{RMSE(\widehat{\vartheta}_{r,oracle})}$
50	30.71	18.70	0	0.208	0.340	1.628
100	77.59	23.26	0	0.2002	0.258	1.29
200	170.30	29.39	0	0.1982	0.232	1.17
300	265.17	33.89	0	0.1978	0.223	1.13
400	362.43	37.89	0	0.1987	0.219	1.10

Table 1: Monte Carlo RMSE estimates for the oracle estimator $\widehat{\vartheta}_{r,oracle}$ and for the fully data-driven estimator $\widehat{\vartheta}_r$ for the volume of the annulus $A = B(0.5, 0.5) \setminus B(0.5, 0.25)$ with respect to r and $n = \lambda|A|$, the number of points lying inside the wrapping hull $N_\circ$, the number of points on the boundary of the wrapping hull N_∂ and the number of isolated points of the boundary of the wrapping hull N_{iso}.

$n = \lambda/\lvert A\rvert$	$\widehat{r}$	$RMSE(\widehat{\vartheta}_{\widehat{r}})$
50	0.088	0.36
100	0.085	0.160
200	0.084	0.069
300	0.105	0.033
400	0.125	0.0182
500	0.149	0.0123
1000	0.165	0.0056

Table 2: Monte Carlo RMSE estimates for the adaptive estimator $\widehat{\vartheta}_{\widehat{r}}$ for the volume of the annulus $A = B(0.5, 0.5) \setminus B(0.5, 0.25)$ with respect to $n = \lambda|A|$.



Figure 7: Monte Carlo RMSE estimates for the oracle estimator for the volume of the annulus $B(0.5, 0.5) \setminus B(0.5, 0.25)$ with respect to r.

for any $\mathcal{A}$-measurable function $T : \mathbf{A} \to \mathbb{R}$. From the likelihood in (2.1) for $\lambda = \lambda_0$, we derive

$$\mathbb{E}_A\big[T(\widehat{A})\big] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{E}}\Big[T(\widehat{A}) \exp\big(\lambda|\mathbf{E} \setminus A|\big)\mathbf{1}(\widehat{A} \subseteq A)\Big] .$$

Since $\exp(\lambda|\mathbf{E} \setminus A|)$ is deterministic, we have $\forall A \in \mathbf{A}$

$$\mathbb{E}_A\big[T(\widehat{A})\big] = 0 \implies \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{E}}\big[T(\widehat{A})\mathbf{1}(\widehat{A} \subseteq A)\big] = 0 .$$

Splitting $T = T^+ - T^-$ with non-negative $\mathcal{A}$-measurable functions T^+ and T^-, we infer that the measures $\mu^{\pm}(B) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{E}}[T^{\pm}(\widehat{A})\mathbf{1}(\widehat{A} \in B)]$, $B \in \mathcal{A}$, agree on $\{[B] \,|\, B \in \mathbf{A}\}$, where $[B] = \{A \in \mathbf{A} | A \subseteq B\}$. Since the brackets $\{[B] \,|\, B \in \mathbf{A}\}$ generate the σ-algebra $\mathcal{A}$ the measures $\mu^{\pm}(B)$ agree on all sets in $\mathcal{A}$, in particular on $\{T > 0\}$ and $\{T < 0\}$, which entails $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{E}}[T^+(\widehat{A})] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{E}}[T^-(\widehat{A})] = 0$. Thus, $T(\widehat{A}) = 0$ holds $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{E}}$-a.s.

6.1.2 Proof of Theorem 4.4

The following proof is an adaptation of the proof of Thm. 4.4 and Thm. 4.5 in Baldin and Reiß (2016). To make the presentation self-contained, we prefer to include it here

Define a *pseudo*-estimator of the volume $|A|$,

$$\widehat{\vartheta}_{pseudo} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} |\widehat{A}| + |\widehat{A}| N_\partial \Big(\frac{1}{N_\circ + 1} + \frac{\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda_\circ}}{\lambda_\circ}\Big) .$$

It satisfies $\mathbb{E}[\widehat{\vartheta}_{pseudo}] = |A|$ as it follows from Theorem 4.1. Applying the triangle inequality in the L^2-norm, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(\widehat{\vartheta} - |A|)^2]^{1/2} &\leqslant \mathbb{E}[(\widehat{\vartheta} - \widehat{\vartheta}_{pseudo})^2]^{1/2} + \mathrm{Var}(\widehat{\vartheta}_{pseudo})^{1/2} \\ &\leqslant \lambda^{-1}\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda|A|}\mathbb{E}\big[N_\partial^2 \mathrm{e}^{2\lambda|A\setminus\widehat{A}|}\big]^{1/2} + \mathrm{Var}(\widehat{\vartheta}_{pseudo})^{1/2} . \end{aligned} \tag{6.1}$$

By the law of total variance, it holds

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Var}(\widehat{\vartheta}_{pseudo}) &= \mathrm{Var}\big(\mathbb{E}[\widehat{\vartheta}_{pseudo}|\widehat{A}]\big) + \mathbb{E}\big[\mathrm{Var}(\widehat{\vartheta}_{pseudo}|\widehat{A})\big] \\ &= \mathrm{Var}(\widehat{\vartheta}_{oracle}) + \mathbb{E}\Big[(N_\partial|\widehat{A}|)^2\mathrm{Var}\Big(\frac{1}{N_\circ+1}|\widehat{A}\Big)\Big]\,. \end{aligned} \tag{6.2}$$

Theorem 3.1 entails $N_\circ \,|\, \widehat{A} \sim \mathrm{Poiss}(\lambda_\circ)$. Hence the conditional variance can for $\lambda_\circ \to \infty$ be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Var}((1+N_\circ)^{-1}|\,\widehat{A}) &\leqslant \mathbb{E}[(N_\circ+1)^{-2}|\,\widehat{A}] = \lambda_\circ^{-1}\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda_\circ}\int_0^{\lambda_\circ}(\mathrm{e}^t-1)/t\,dt \\ &\leqslant \lambda_\circ^{-1}\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda_\circ}\int_{\lambda_\circ/2}^{\lambda_\circ}\mathrm{e}^t/t\,dt - (\lambda_\circ)^{-2} + O(\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda_\circ/4}) \\ &= (\lambda_\circ)^{-1}\int_0^{\lambda_\circ/2}\mathrm{e}^{-s}\Big(\frac{1}{\lambda_\circ-s}-\frac{1}{\lambda_\circ}\Big)\,ds + O(\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda_\circ/4}) \\ &= \lambda_\circ^{-3}(1+o(1))\,,\end{aligned}$$

where we have used $(\lambda_\circ - s)^{-1} - \lambda_\circ^{-1} = s\lambda_\circ^{-1}(\lambda_\circ - s)^{-1}$, $\int_0^\infty s\mathrm{e}^{-s}ds = 1$ and dominated convergence. Due to $(N_\circ+1)^{-1} \in [0,1]$ we thus conclude for some constant $c \geqslant 1$

$$\mathrm{Var}((1+N_\circ)^{-1}|\,\widehat{A}) \leqslant c(1 \wedge \lambda_\circ^{-3}).$$

Plugging this back into (6.2) in view of (3.4) and the identity $\mathbb{E}[N_\partial] = \lambda\mathbb{E}[|A \setminus \widehat{A}|]$ from (6.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\mathrm{Var}(\widehat{\vartheta}_{pseudo})}{\mathrm{Var}(\widehat{\vartheta}_{oracle})} &\leqslant 1 + c\frac{\mathbb{E}\big[(N_\partial\lambda|\widehat{A}|)^2 \wedge (N_\partial)^2(\lambda|\widehat{A}|)^{-1}\big]}{\lambda\mathbb{E}[|A\setminus\widehat{A}|]} \\ &= 1 + c\frac{\mathbb{E}\big[(N_\partial)^2\big((\lambda|\widehat{A}|)^2 \wedge (\lambda|\widehat{A}|)^{-1}\big)\big]}{\mathbb{E}[N_\partial]}\,.\end{aligned}$$

Define the "good" event $\mathcal{G} = \{|\widehat{A}| > |A|/2\}$, on which $\big((\lambda|\widehat{A}|)^2 \wedge (\lambda|\widehat{A}|)^{-1}\big) \leqslant 2(\lambda|A|)^{-1}$. On the complement $\mathcal{G}^c$, we infer from $a^2 \wedge a^{-1} \leqslant 1$ for $a > 0$

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[(N_\partial)^2\big((\lambda|\widehat{A}|)^2 \wedge (\lambda|\widehat{A}|)^{-1}\big)\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{G}^c}\Big] \leqslant \mathbb{E}\big[N_\partial^2\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{G}^c}\big] \leqslant \mathbb{E}[N_\partial^4]^{1/2}\mathbb{P}(|A\setminus\widehat{A}| \geqslant |A|/2)^{1/2}\,.$$

On the event $\mathcal{G}$, it holds

$$\frac{\mathrm{Var}(\widehat{\vartheta}_{pseudo})}{\mathrm{Var}(\widehat{\vartheta}_{oracle})} \leqslant 1 + \frac{2c}{\lambda|A|}\frac{\mathbb{E}[N_\partial^2]}{\mathbb{E}[N_\partial]} = 1 + \frac{2c}{\lambda|A|}\Big(\frac{\mathrm{Var}(N_\partial)}{\mathbb{E}[N_\partial]} + \mathbb{E}[N_\partial]\Big)\,. \tag{6.3}$$

Using Proposition 4.5 and the identity $\mathbb{E}[N_\partial] = \lambda\mathbb{E}[|A\setminus\widehat{A}|]$ from (6.5), we derive $\mathrm{Var}(N_\partial) \leqslant c_0\lambda^2\mathrm{Var}(|A\setminus\widehat{A}|)$ for some constant $c_0 > 0$. Thus, (6.3) is bounded by

$$\frac{\mathrm{Var}(\widehat{\vartheta}_{pseudo})}{\mathrm{Var}(\widehat{\vartheta}_{oracle})} \leqslant 1 + \frac{2b}{|A|}\Big(\frac{\mathrm{Var}(|A\setminus\widehat{A}|)}{\mathbb{E}[|A\setminus\widehat{A}|]} + \mathbb{E}[|A\setminus\widehat{A}|]\Big)\,.$$

Finally, considering $N_\partial^2\mathrm{e}^{2\lambda|A\setminus\widehat{A}|}$ on $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{G}^c$, the first term in (6.1) can be bounded by $r(\lambda, A)$. The universal bound on $\alpha(\lambda, A)$ follows from the rough bound $\mathbb{E}[|A\setminus\widehat{A}|^2] \leqslant |A|\mathbb{E}[|A\setminus\widehat{A}|]$.

6.1.3 Set-indexed processes, stopping sets and the proof of Theorem 3.1

Recall that a random compact set $\mathcal{K}$ is called an $\mathcal{F}_K$-stopping set if $\{\mathcal{K} \subseteq K\} \in \mathcal{F}_K$ for all $K \in \mathbf{K}$. The sigma-algebra of $\mathcal{K}$-history is defined as $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{K}} = \{A \in \mathfrak{F} : A \cap \{\mathcal{K} \subseteq K\} \in \mathcal{F}_K \ \forall K \in \mathbf{K}\}$, where $\mathfrak{F} = \sigma(\mathcal{F}_K; K \in \mathbf{K})$. Let us collect some useful results proved in Baldin and Reiß (2016). The following statement is a generalisation of the analogous statement for time-indexed stochastic processes.

Lemma 6.1. *The random variable $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{K})$ is measurable with respect to $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{K}}$ for any stopping set $\mathcal{K}$.*

The set-indexed process $(\mathcal{N}(K), K \in \mathbf{K})$ has independent increments, i.e. for $K_1, \dots, K_m \in \mathbf{K}$ with $K_i \subseteq K_{i+1}$, $i = 1, \dots, m-1$, the random variables $\mathcal{N}(K_{i+1}) - \mathcal{N}(K_i) = \mathcal{N}(K_{i+1} \setminus K_i)$ are independent (by the independence of the PPP on disjoint sets). Furthermore, we say that a set-indexed, $(\mathcal{F}_K)$-adapted integrable process $(X_K, K \in \mathbf{K})$ is a martingale if $\mathbb{E}[X_B | \mathcal{F}_A] = X_A$ holds for any $A, B \in \mathbf{K}$ with $A \subseteq B$. By the independence of increments, the process

$$M_K \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{N}(K) - \lambda |K|, \quad K \in \mathbf{K},$$

is clearly a martingale with respect to its natural filtration $(\mathcal{F}_K, K \in \mathbf{K})$. Applying the martingale characterisation of the set-indexed Poisson process, see Thm. 3.1 in Ivanoff and Merzbach (1994) (analogue of Watanabe's characterisation for the Poisson process), to the martingale $(M_K, K \in \mathbf{K})$, we show in Proposition 6.2 that the process $\mathcal{N}$ is even a *strong Markov* set-indexed process, see Baldin and Reiß (2016) for an accurate proof.

Proposition 6.2. *The set-indexed process $(\mathcal{N}(K), K \in \mathbf{K})$ is* strong Markov *at every stopping set $\mathcal{K}$. More precisely, conditionally on $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{K}}$ the process $(\mathcal{N}(K \setminus \mathcal{K}), K \in \mathbf{K})$ is a Poisson point process with intensity λ on $\mathcal{K}^c$. In particular, $\mathcal{N}(K \setminus \mathcal{K}) \,\big|\, \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{K}} \sim Poiss(\lambda |K \setminus \mathcal{K}|)$ holds for all $K \in \mathbf{K}$ and*

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{N}(K \setminus \mathcal{K})] = \lambda \mathbb{E}[|K \setminus \mathcal{K}|]. \tag{6.4}$$

In particular, Proposition 6.2 yields (3.2) using that the closed complement $\mathcal{K} = \overline{\widehat{A}^c}$ of the wrapping hull is a stopping set. Moreover, (6.4) yields a rather striking relation between the number of points N_∂ lying on the wrapping hull $\widehat{A}$ and the missing volume $|A \setminus \widehat{A}|$, which resembles Efron's identity:

$$\mathbb{E}[N_\partial] = \lambda \, \mathbb{E}[|A \setminus \widehat{A}|]. \tag{6.5}$$

The last statement of Theorem 3.1, that $\mathcal{F}_{\widehat{\mathcal{K}}} = \sigma(\widehat{A})$ for $\mathcal{K} = \overline{\widehat{A}^c}$ follows from the following lemma. It can be seen as a generalisation of the interesting fact that for a time-indexed Poisson process the sigma-algebra $\sigma(\tau)$ associated with the first jump time τ coincides with the sigma-algebra of τ-history $\mathcal{F}_\tau$.

Lemma 6.3. *The sigma-algebra $\sigma(\widehat{A}) = \sigma(\{\widehat{A} \subseteq B, B \in \mathcal{A}\})$ coincides with the sigma-algebra $\mathcal{F}_{\widehat{\mathcal{K}}}$ of $\widehat{\mathcal{K}}$-history for the stopping set $\mathcal{K} = \overline{\widehat{A}^c}$, i.e. $\sigma(\widehat{A}) = \mathcal{F}_{\widehat{\mathcal{K}}}$.*

The main idea of the proof is that the sigma-algebra $\mathcal{F}_{\widehat{\mathcal{K}}}$ coincides with the sigma-algebra $\sigma(\{\mathcal{N}(\widehat{\mathcal{K}} \cap K), K \in \mathbf{K}\})$ generated by the process stopped at $\widehat{\mathcal{K}}$. This statement can be derived from Thm. 6, Ch. 1 in Shiryaev and Aries (2007). Finally, observe that by definition of the wrapping hull $\mathcal{N}(\overline{\widehat{A}^c} \cap K) = \mathcal{N}((\partial \widehat{A}) \cap K)$. Modulo null sets, $\mathcal{N}((\partial \widehat{A}) \cap K)$ counts the number of vertices of $\widehat{A}$ in K and is thus $\sigma(\widehat{A})$-measurable.

Acknowledgements

The author is grateful to Markus Reiß at Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin for hosting him in January 2016 and valuable discussions which originated this research. The author further thanks Quentin Berthet for helpful comments.

References

Arndt, J., and C. Haenel (2001): *Pi-unleashed*. Springer.

Baddeley, A., and R. Turner (2005): "spatstat: An R Package for Analyzing Spatial Point Patterns," *Journal of Statistical Software*, 12(6), 1–42, `http://www.jstatsoft.org/v12/i06/`.

Baldin, N., and M. Reiss (2016): "Unbiased estimation of the volume of a convex body," *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 126, 3716–3732.

Bárány, I., and D. Larman (1988): "Convex bodies, economic cap coverings, random polytopes," *Mathematika*, 35(2), 274–291.

Bárány, I., and M. Reitzner (2010): "On the variance of random polytopes," *Advances in Mathematics*, 225(4), 1986–2001.

Beermann, M., and M. Reitzner (2015): "Beyond the Efron-Buchta identities: Distributional Results for Poisson Polytopes," *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 53(1), 226–244.

Brunel, V.-E. (2013): "A universal deviation inequality for random polytopes," arXiv:1311.2902.

——— (2014): "Non-parametric estimation of convex bodies and convex polytopes," Theses, Université Pierre et Marie Curie - Paris VI ; University of Haifa, `https://tel.archives-ouvertes.fr/tel-01066977`.

Cuevas, A., and R. Fraiman (1997): "A Plug-in Approach to Support Estimation," *The Annals of Statistics*, 25(6), 2300–2312.

Cuevas, A., R. Fraiman, and B. Pateiro-López (2012): "On statistical properties of sets fulfilling rolling-type conditions," *Advances in Applied Probability*, 44(2), 311–329.

Devroye, L., and G. Wise (1980): "Detection of abnormal behavior via nonparametric estimation of the support," *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 38(3), 480–488.

Dyer, M., A. Frieze, and R. Kannan (1991): "A random polynomial-time algorithm for approximating the volume of convex bodies," *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 38(1), 1–17.

Efron, B. (1965): "The convex hull of a random set of points," *Biometrika*, 52(3-4), 331–343.

Gayraud, G. (1997): "Estimation of functionals of density support," *Mathematical Methods of Statistics*, 6(1), 26–46.

Giné, E., and R. Nickl (2016): *Mathematical Foundations of Infinite-Dimensional Statistical Models*, Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics. Cambridge University Press.

Ivanoff, B., and E. Merzbach (1994): "A martingale characterization of the set-indexed Poisson process," *Stochastics: An International Journal of Probability and Stochastic Processes*, 51(1-2), 69–82.

Kallenberg, O. (2002): *Foundations of Modern Probability*, Probability and Its Applications. Springer.

Kannan, R., L. Lovász, and M. Simonovits (1997): "Random walks and an $\mathcal{O}(n^5)$ volume algorithm for convex bodies," *Random Structures and Algorithms*, 11(1), 1–50.

Kendall, D. (1974): "Foundations of a theory of random sets," *Stochastic geometry*, 3(9).

Kingman, J. (1992): *Poisson processes*, vol. 3. Oxford University Press.

Korostelev, A., and A. Tsybakov (1993a): "Estimation of the density support and its functionals.," *Probl. Inf. Transm.*, 29(1), 1–15.

——— (1993b): *Minimax theory of image reconstruction*. Springer.

——— (1994): "Asymptotic efficiency in estimation of a convex set," *Problemy Peredachi Informatsii*, 30(4), 33–44.

Kutoyants, Y. (1998): *Statistical Inference for Spatial Poisson Processes*, Lecture Notes in Statistics. Springer.

Lepskii, O. (1992): "Asymptotically minimax adaptive estimation. I: Upper bounds. Optimally adaptive estimates," *Theory of Probability & Its Applications*, 36(4), 682–697.

Lovász, L., and S. Vempala (2006): "Simulated annealing in convex bodies and an $\mathcal{O}(n^4)$ volume algorithm," *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 72(2), 392–417.

Mammen, E., and A. Tsybakov (1995): "Asymptotical Minimax Recovery of Sets with Smooth Boundaries," *The Annals of Statistics*, 23(2), 502–524.

Mason, D., and W. Polonik (2009): "Asymptotic normality of plug-in level set estimates," *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 19(3), 1108–1142.

Molchanov, I. (2006): *Theory of random sets*. Springer.

Pardon, J. (2011): "Central limit theorems for random polygons in an arbitrary convex set," *The Annals of Probability*, 39(3), 881–903.

Pateiro-López, B. (2008): "Set estimation under convexity type restrictions," Theses, Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, `eio.usc.es/pub/pateiro/files/thesis_beatrizpateirolopez.pdf`.

Perkal, J. (1956): "Sur les ensembles ϵ-convexes," *Colloquium Mathematicae*, 4(1), 1–10.

Privault, N. (2012): "Invariance of Poisson measures under random transformations," *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré, Probabilités et Statistiques*, 48(4), 947–972.

Reiss, M., and L. Selk (2017): "Estimating nonparametric functionals efficiently under one-sided errors," *Bernoulli*, 23(2), 1022–1055, arXiv:1407.4229.

Reitzner, M. (2003): "Random polytopes and the Efron–Stein jackknife inequality," *The Annals of Probability*, 31(4), 2136–2166.

——— (2005): "Central limit theorems for random polytopes," *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 133(4), 483–507.

Resnick, S. (2013): *Extreme values, regular variation and point processes*. Springer.

Rigollet, P., and R. Vert (2009): "Optimal rates for plug-in estimators of density level sets," *Bernoulli*, 15(4), 1154–1178.

Schütt, C. (1994): "Random polytopes and affine surface area," *Mathematische Nachrichten*, 170(1), 227–249.

Shiryaev, A., and A. Aries (2007): *Optimal stopping rules*. Springer.

Tsybakov, A. (1997): "On nonparametric estimation of density level sets," *The Annals of Statistics*, 25(3), 948–969.

Vempala, S. (2010): "Recent Progress and Open Problems in Algorithmic Convex Geometry.," in *IARCS Annual Conference on Foundations of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science (FSTTCS 2010)*, vol. 8 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pp. 42–64. Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik.

Vu, V. (2005): "Sharp concentration of random polytopes," *Geometric and Functional Analysis*, 15(6), 1284–1318.

Walther, G. (1995): "On a generalization of Blaschke's Rolling Theorem and the smoothing of surfaces," *Mathematical Methods in the Applied Sciences*, 22(4), 301–316.

——— (1997): "Granulometric smoothing," *The Annals of Statistics*, 25(6), 2273–2299.

Zuyev, S. (1999): "Stopping sets: Gamma-type results and hitting properties," *Advances in Applied Probability*, 31(2), 355–366.